

**CASE STUDY:
City of Tucson, Arizona**

**An Evolving Performance
Measurement Culture**

September 2002

Principal Researchers:

David J. Bernstein

**Funding for this research has been provided
By a grant from the Sloan Foundation**



GASB SEA RESEARCH CASE STUDY

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
TYPES OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS	5
OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND	6
History	6
FINDINGS.....	10
PEOPLE AND THEIR ROLES	10
Who has been involved in initiating, developing, and using performance measurement, and how have they been involved?	10
What intended and expected uses and effects of performance measurement were articulated?	12
What actual uses and effects of performance measurement were identified?	12
PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	18
How is the quality of performance information perceived, and how have performance-measurement quality issues been addressed?	18
What kinds of organizational supports are provided, and how have organizations been changing to accommodate performance measurement?	20
EVOLUTION OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	21
What barriers have been identified to making effective use of performance measurement, and are those barriers being addressed?	21
What lessons have been learned from the performance measurement experience to date?	21
What are future expectations for the use of performance measurement?.....	22
REFERENCES	23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Throughout the 1990s, the [City of Tucson](#), Arizona, refined a culture to encourage use of performance measures. In the early to mid-1990s, the [City Manager](#) emphasized use of output and workload measures for resource allocation and encouraged development and reporting of an extensive number of performance measures for the budget process. A new [City Manager](#) appointed in 1996 wanted to simplify collection and reporting of measures, preferring development of department and division missions with collection and reporting of a smaller number of output and outcome measures. A Budget Format Committee made up of department directors became the driving force for reform of the performance measurement process. A desire by the [Mayor](#) and [City Council](#) to involve the community in setting goals for the City led to establishment of [Livable Tucson](#), an initiative that involved over 1,000 citizens in identifying 17 community goals, with 69 key outcomes to determine if goals were being achieved. These activities, combined with participation in the [ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Project](#), set the context for an evolving performance measurement system in Tucson.

It is clear from inclusion of performance measures in the budget development process that there was an intent to link performance measurement with resource allocation. Livable Tucson was intended to identify goals the community wanted to see achieved. The [FY99-2000 budget](#) was put together to address the Livable Tucson goals, and provide information on what City departments were doing to achieve those goals. An examination of the FY99-00 budget demonstrated that key outputs, outcomes, and a description of support for the Livable Tucson goals. It appears, therefore, that while performance measures may not be directly used to support the decision process, performance measures are used to inform and justify support for decisions once decisions are made. An example of a department that is heavily dependent on performance measures for resource allocation and decision making is the [Fire Department](#). According to the Fire Chief, the Department has been able to increase staffing and operational levels, a fact which he directly attributes to the Department's use of performance measures. Detailed reports on specific areas of the City have been useful in generating political support for adding resources and building fire stations by demonstrating that the resources were needed to ensure service equity. Interviewees from other departments also mentioned that performance measures make it easier to support requests for additional resources, and that regular reporting prevents having to scramble to provide justification for what was accomplished during the prior fiscal year.

Interviewees said that performance measures are intended to track what City departments do, how well the City departments perform those services, and to monitor how the City government is performing. While not addressed directly, interviewee comments indicated that there was an expectation that improvement in government performance would lead to more effective program performance. Senior managers indicated that even if not used for this purpose at higher levels of the government, there is an assumption that departments will use measures internally for this purpose. Interestingly, senior City managers did not provide any examples of strategic planning, performance monitoring, or performance improvement. This could be a reflection of senior management's acknowledgement that departments are expected to track performance measures for their own departments, even if regular reports are not sent to the City Manager. It is reasonable to expect that as the City gets more experience with the [Livable Tucson](#) community

goal-setting and tracking process, and if regular reporting of performance measures is re-instituted, performance improvement will receive additional attention from City management.

While external reporting has not been a driving force behind Tucson performance measurement efforts, it is logical to assume that the more recent focus on Livable Tucson may result in additional expectations about the availability of performance measures, especially measures that can be used to monitor community conditions. The budget has been the primary focus for external reporting of performance measures. One interviewee outside of the City government was quite skeptical, stating that the intent of the early performance measurement effort was to, “fill up a bunch of pages in the budget so people would read the performance measures and not the budget.” The experience under the former City Manager was sufficiently traumatic that when a new City Manager was appointed in 1996, he expressed concern about spending taxpayer dollars to communicate government performance, and felt that the City government would be criticized for spending money to promote itself. As he put it, “those that toot their own horn are broadly criticized, so we have chosen not to focus on those sorts of things.” While not used extensively for communication outside of the government, performance measures are extensively used for internal communication and accountability.

In terms of internal use of performance measurement reports, many departmental interviewees said that they used monthly and quarterly reports as a tool for communication with managers and staff. In many cases these reports were compiled to develop an annual report, and are the source of information provided in the budget process. There was a sense among some interviewees that accountability is important, and that the attention to performance measurement during the 1990s had done much to promote accountability throughout the City government. Attention to accountability seemed especially heightened among department heads, as reflected by the activities and recommendations of the Budget Format Committee. Even with the changes in focus of performance measurement efforts, and the changes in the approach to performance reporting in the Office of the City Manager, the sense within the City government that accountability is important seems to have grown as a result of the City’s performance measurement efforts. While a small number of citizens probably review performance measures as reported in the budget document, one interviewee correctly pointed out that the budget is available to be reviewed, should someone desire to do so, and that accountability is thus strengthened.

Efforts to focus on the quality of performance measures were enhanced by a Budget Format Committee made up of department heads with staff support from the Department of Budget and Research. The Committee conducted a two-year review of the City’s performance measures in relationship to how measures are reported in the budget, and in response to the [Livable Tucson](#) Project. As one interviewee put it, the effort took departmental performance measures apart and put back them back together again. Members of the Committee met with individual departments to help them rewrite and refine data. Those interviewees that commented on the process indicated that the results were useful, with a reduction in the number of measures and a general focus that more clearly reflected department and division missions.

The Project Manager for Performance Systems provided training on development of departmental missions and key outputs and outcomes as a component of the reformatting of the

budget. As a component of the [Livable Tucson Vision Project](#), extensive community training was provided. Two community trainings on government accountability were provided, funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and designed and facilitated by ICMA, the National Civic League, and the City. The trainings introduced community leaders to the role of the public in measuring government performance, including identifying the difference between outputs and outcomes. The trainings were useful for Budget and Research staff who worked with departments to develop performance measures, and who developed in-house training for city departments in fall of 1997. Budget and Research staff trained over 200 key managers on how budgets should reflect community priorities. The FY98-99 budget was then formatted to reflect the community's goals. Six workshops were held in the spring of 1998 to develop indicators of livability related to each of the Goals (City of Tucson, 1998).

Given the evolution of performance measurement in Tucson during the 1990s, particularly in the period from 1993 to 1996, it is not surprising that one interviewee indicated that one barrier to effective use of performance measures is collecting large volumes of data that are not useful or used. What is surprising is that only one interviewee said so. The most frequent barrier cited by interviewees was addressing the perception that staff lacks the time to collect performance information (three interviewees). Three interviewees addressed the issue of support for performance measurement efforts, indicating that performance measurement will not last if it is viewed as a fad, if the organization cannot be convinced of the value of performance information, or if the City Manager believed that measurement and reporting is not important. As for lessons learned, interviewees expressed a wide variety of responses. Some of the lessons learned are most informative given the City's history with performance measurement. Performance measurement must be instilled in the culture, or else it is difficult to make measurement happen in a short time. Buy-in from middle and lower levels of the organization is critical, since data is generated at that level. If there had been a stronger signal from top (i.e., the City Manager and his staff) of the importance of performance measurement, and an indication of how it was going to be used, then some of the growing pains could have been minimized. One would expect that, with the City's recent emphasis on Livable Tucson, the growing pains may continue, although there seems to be much more agreement about this process, and the City's management and elected officials have made clear that the information will be used to improve the community.

Table 1

TYPES OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS

Interviewee/Official	Title	Organization
Fred Shipman	Fire Chief	Fire Department
Dan Larkin	Assistant Fire Chief	Fire Department
Ned Zolman	Director	Department of Budget and Research
Dave Burns	Administrator	Fleet Services Division, Department of Operations
Karen Thoreson	Director	Community Services Dept.
Kay Gray	Director	Finance
Luis Gutierrez	City Manager	City of Tucson
Ron Koenig	Housing Administrator	Community Services Dept.

Ron Meyerson	Director	Department of Operations
Tony Luebbermann	Project Manager	Department of Budget and Research
Shirley C. Scott	Council Member	Ward IV, City Council
Carol Benson	Council Aide	Ward IV, City Council
Mimi Gray	Chair	Community Development Advisory Committee
Joe Burchell	Staff Writer	Arizona Daily Star

OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

The [City of Tucson](#) is the second largest city in Arizona, with an estimated 1997 population of 455,085 constituting ten percent of the State's population. The City, founded in 1775, is the county seat for [Pima County](#), and the Tucson metropolitan area has a population of 804,200 ([Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce](#), 1997). The City operates under a Council-Manager form of government. The legislative body is comprised of the [Mayor](#) and six [Council Members](#) who are elected at-large, and it establishes policies for the city. The appointed City Manager, his staff, and the city department directors implement Council policies (City of Tucson, August 1999). After a long career in the City government, Luis Gutierrez was appointed City Manager in 1996.

History

Tucson began developing performance measures in the 1970s when, according to the Director of [Budget and Research](#), the City used a Planning, Programs and Budgeting System (PPBS). In the budgets of the 1970s, the City provided statistics, along the lines of performance measures, to track services. In the late 1970s and 1980s, this type of reporting transitioned into performance measurement.

During the 1990s, Tucson underwent a gradual evolution in the City's use of performance measures. As illustrated in Figure 1, four separate performance-use initiatives in the 1990s were identified during interviews with the City Manager and central agency staff (senior officials), department managers and staff, elected officials and staff, citizen volunteers, and the media. For each initiative, Figure 1 includes the title of the initiative; the focus of measurement activities; the types of performance measures collected and reported; the relative number of performance measures; involvement of the City Manager; involvement of the community; and limitations. Each of the initiatives will be described below.




In 1994, the City became one of 44 cities with population in excess of 100,000 to participate in the International City/County Management Association's Comparative Performance Measurement Project. The project involved developing comparative measures in four areas, including Police Services, Fire Services, Neighborhood Services, and Support Services (ICMA, 2000). In order to ensure comparability among jurisdictions, a large number of performance measures are collected. Tony Luebbermann, Project Manager for Performance Systems in the Department of Budget and Research, has coordinated the City's participation. Individual department representatives work with committees in each of the four subject areas. Performance reports are produced annually, and participating jurisdictions can gain access to a members-only section of the ICMA web page.

In 1993, Michael Brown was appointed City Manager. According to several interviewees, Mr. Brown was very committed to quantifying the work being done by the City. Mr. Brown focused on department accountability, department work programs, and tying funding to

performance measures. Performance measurement was a way to look at the results of work performed by City staff, and to communicate with the public using performance measurement reports in the annual operating budget.

In the beginning, there was a lot of agreement with what was being considered for performance measurement, but as time passed, the focus of departments and the City Manager appeared to diverge. Some departments became uncomfortable with Mr. Brown's insistence that a large number of performance measures be collected. The majority of measures were output and workload measures, in deference to Mr. Brown's focus on resource allocation issues. Measures were geared to internal accomplishment and outputs, with some information ostensibly provided to the community on what they were getting for their investment. A Project Management and Analysis Template (PMAT) was developed to support a focus on completion of priority projects. While the PMAT system does not seem to directly incorporate performance measures, according to one interviewee, performance measures may capture data related to project management in a way that transcends two or three budget years, thus providing a great benefit for staff and department accountability. After a time, concerns were raised about how cumbersome it was to track performance measurement information. One interviewee noted that Mr. Brown often made decisions based on criteria other than performance measures, which may have contributed to the initial effort of the 1990s not being entirely successful. As one interviewee put it, the City created a lot of measures, but they had no value, and there was no sense that departments' measurement efforts were part of a Citywide system.

Figure 1
Recent Evolution of Performance Measurement in Tucson, Arizona

YEAR BEGUN	→ 1993	→ 1994	→ 1997	→ 1998
INITIATIVE	Budget Cycle Performance Measurement	ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Program ¹ 	Revised Budget Cycle Performance Measurement ² 	Livable Tucson Vision Program ³ 
FOCUS OF MEASUREMENT ACTIVITIES	Measuring Efficiency and Workload	Comparative Benchmarking of Service Delivery	Measuring Outputs and Outcomes	Community-Driven Goals and Key Measures
TYPE OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES	Mostly Outputs and Workload	Police Services Fire Services Neighborhoods Support Services	Outputs and Outcomes	Key Indicators of Progress
NUMBER OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES	Large Number Per Section and Activity	Limited to Services Identified, But A Lot of Measures to Ensure Comparability	3-5 Key Outputs and 1-3 Key Outcomes per division	69 Key Indicators
INVOLVEMENT OF CITY MANAGER	Quarterly Reports and Annual Meetings	Largely Delegated; Reviews During Budget Process	Semi-Annual Reviews Recommended	Annual Reviews in Budget
INVOLVEMENT OF COMMUNITY	Advisory Committees, If Applicable	Advisory Committees, If Applicable	Advisory Committee If Applicable	1,200 Citizens; Workshops On Accountability, Community Goals, And Performance Measures
LIMITATIONS	Not Focused, Too Many Measures	Does Not Cover All City Services	Desire for More Community Input and Accountability	Too Soon to Tell

Sources: Interviews provided information for Figure 1, except as noted.

1. ICMA (2000).
2. City of Tucson, Department of Budget and Research (1997); Luebberrmann (1997); Meyerson (March 15, 1999).
3. City of Tucson (1998).

In 1996, Mr. Gutierrez replaced Mr. Brown as City Manager. Mr. Gutierrez wanted the performance measurement system simplified, with emphasis on outputs and outcomes. The City Manager formed a Budget Format Committee, which was comprised of eight to nine department directors and staffed by Mr. Luebbermann. Ron Meyerson, Director of the Department of Operations, chaired the Committee. The Committee was directed to develop a new budget format that would streamline and simplify the budget so it would more effectively communicate to the community and highlight City services by placing emphasis on key measures of performance and outcomes (Gutierrez, 1998). According to one interviewee, the process was a “two year project to take performance measures apart and put them back together.” Departments submitted key measures to the Committee, and after review and discussion, the City Manager and his staff reviewed measures. The FY1998-1999 Adopted Budget was the first to incorporate those changes, and interviewees reported fewer changes but continued attention in the FY1999-2000 budget process.

According to one interviewee, under the new system, performance measures were much more meaningful and understandable, and they got to the crux of what each division and department did. Departments met with the City Manager less regularly to discuss performance measures, although the City Manager reviewed measures and met with departments during the budget process. The Budget Format Committee made a recommendation to require that the City Manager meet with departments to discuss performance measures more regularly (Meyerson, 1999). It was felt that semi-annual reporting of performance measures would heighten the attention paid to performance measurement by the City Manager, his staff, and department heads, as well as help focus budget discussion.

Also during 1998, the City Manager became interested in targeting priorities set by the Mayor and the Council for services provided by the City in conjunction with other agencies, such as the school districts, colleges and universities, the nonprofit sector, civic groups, and businesses. The result was the Livable Tucson, or as one senior official put it, “the Livability thing.” In order to engage citizens in the future of their community, three meetings were held in each of six wards in the City, a three- to four-hour process about what could be done for City neighborhoods. According to a brochure and web page on the project, the [Livable Tucson Vision Program](#) “seeks to make Tucson a better place to live by engaging the community in an inclusive planning process to identify common values, priorities, strategies, and measurable indicators of progress that will be used to shape Tucson’s future.” In addition to the ward meetings, two community trainings on government accountability were held, funded by the [Alfred P. Sloan Foundation](#) and designed and facilitated by the [ICMA](#), the [National Civic League](#), and the City. The trainings introduced community leaders to their role in measuring government performance, including identifying the difference between outputs and outcomes.

Seventeen Livable Tucson goals were developed, reflecting the priorities most commonly articulated by over 700 citizens who participated in community forums (see Table 1). Six workshops in the spring of 1998 developed indicators of livability related to each of the Goals. A total of 69 key indicators of progress were associated with the Livable Tucson Goals. The focus of the measures is on neighborhood and community conditions, although in some cases the connection to government programs and accountability is clear (e.g., percentage of citizens rating local government as responsive). According to the Livable Tucson brochure, an annual “community report card” will be developed to monitor progress towards the goals. Interviewees did not mention the annual report card during the June 1999 site visit, so it is unclear whether a report card has yet been developed. The FY1999-2000 budget contained references to

department contributions to the sustainable, living goals, including information on what departments were doing to arrive at those goals. A description of the goals, including City government support for the goal, key indicators, and what the public can do to help achieve the goal can be found on the [Livable Tucson](#) website.

Table 2
Livable Tucson Goals

	Goal	Number of Measures
1.	Better Alternatives to Automobile Transportation	4
2.	Engaged Community and Responsive Government	3
3.	Safe Neighborhoods	3
4.	Caring, Healthy Families and Youth	5
5.	Excellent Public Education	5
6.	Infill and Reinvestment, Not Urban Sprawl	4
7.	Abundant Urban Green Space and Recreation Areas	4
8.	Protected Natural Desert Environment	4
9.	Better Paying Jobs	5
10.	Clean Air and Quality Water	4
11.	People-Oriented Neighborhoods	5
12.	Respected Historic and Cultural Resources	4
13.	Quality Job Training	4
14.	Reduced Poverty and Greater Equality of Opportunity	3
15.	Strong Local Business	4
16.	Efficient Use of Natural Resources	4
17.	Successful Downtown	4
	Total Measures	69

FINDINGS

PEOPLE AND THEIR ROLES

Who has been involved in initiating, developing, and using performance measurement, and how have they been involved?

Interviewees indicated that the Mayor and the Council had not been involved in the development and use of performance measures, although some interviewees indicated that Council members occasionally raised questions about reported measures. As indicated above, the City Manager had a major impact on the tone and content of Tucson's performance measurement efforts. Mr. Brown wanted a system with extensive quantification of program data, and a heavy emphasis on workload and outputs. Mr. Gutierrez wanted the system to have fewer measures, with a focus on outputs, outcomes, and the Mayor, Council, and community priorities articulated in Livable Tucson. The number and frequency of reviews also seemed to be an issue, with Mr. Brown actively involved in oversight of the use of performance measures, while Mr. Gutierrez preferred to delegate this responsibility to the department heads. As indicated above, the Budget Format Committee recommended that the City Manager receive semi-annual performance measure reports, the first of which would be reviewed prior to or with department budget submissions in order to increase the linkage between performance and resource allocation. The Deputy and Assistant City Managers in Tucson have some responsibility for

program and department oversight, and have been involved in reviewing performance measures. The Budget Format Committee called for the Deputy and Assistant City Managers to have expanded responsibility for more frequent external reporting of performance measures, if deemed necessary (Meyerson, 1999).

The [Department of Budget and Research](#) has been actively involved with the development, reporting, and use of performance measures. Tony Luebbermann, Project Manager for Performance Systems, was the staff person primarily responsible for working on performance-measurement initiatives. Mr. Luebbermann also served as the City's main contact for the ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Project. Departments noted that Mr. Luebbermann readily shares information from ICMA. The Program Evaluation Unit in the Department also assisted departments in using performance measures. Project Manager Chris Kaselemis and Senior Management Analyst Nicole Ewing, along with Julie Edmonds-Mares, Human Resources Administrator for Organizational Development and Effectiveness, were listed as staff resources to assist departments with enhanced development of performance measures for the FY1998-1999 budget (Gutierrez, 1998). Since performance measures are reported in the budget process, budget analysts may review performance measures, and in selected case may work with departments to refine measures.

Department Heads have played a pivotal role in development and use of performance measures, particularly at the point in Mr. Gutierrez's administration when regular reporting of performance measures to the City Manager was discontinued. The inconsistency of this process, in part, led to the development of the Budget Format Committee. Department managers and staff had the primary responsibility for developing, collecting, tracking, and reporting performance measures, as in other local governments. Typically, measures were developed at the divisional level and brought forward to the Director for review and approval. One department director indicated that his/her role was not to dictate measures, but rather to play devil's advocate to make sure that measures are clear and that measures focus on what the department seeks to accomplish. In at least two departments, senior managers (division heads) reviewed performance measures as a group, either during the budget process or on a regular basis (monthly or quarterly reports). In some departments, performance measures and monthly or quarterly reports are shared with staff in operating units (e.g., the Fire Department distributes reports to fire stations). Most departments had a designated staff person responsible for collecting performance measures from operational units and compiling those measures into regular reports. In addition, selective departments that participate in the ICMA project invited staff to sit on subject-specific steering committees to assist with the development of the comparative performance measures.

Some departments have advisory committees comprised of citizens and other community volunteers. According to some of the interviewees, these advisory committees have received copies of quarterly and other reports and may have had some input to guide development of additional measures. As indicated above, citizens were also extensively involved in the development of goals key indicators for the [Livable Tucson Vision Program](#).

USES AND EFFECTS OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

What intended and expected uses and effects of performance measurement were articulated?

What actual uses and effects of performance measurement were identified?

Introduction to Use of Performance Measures

The City Manager indicated that his goal for using performance measures was to provide management with a gauge of the effectiveness of the City government, with a focus on the outcomes to be achieved and the nature of public service that citizens receive. The City Manager expressed a need for more interdepartmental coordination and collaboration to maximize service to the public, and indicated that City departments will work together to achieve the Livability Goals.

This section of the case study will discuss the intent and expectations, actual use, and the effect of use of performance measures in Tucson. Three subsections will allow examination of performance-measurement use for resource allocation and decision making, strategic planning, performance monitoring and improvement, and accountability and communication.

Resource Allocation And Other Decision Making

Intent and Expectations

It is clear from inclusion of performance measures in the budget development process that there was an intent to link performance measurement with resource allocation. Some interviewees expressed the hope that performance measures would make resources more responsive to the community and help determine where to put resources. Livable Tucson was intended to identify goals the community wanted to see achieved. The [FY1999-2000 budget](#) was put together to address the Livable Tucson goals, and provide information on what City departments were doing to achieve those goals. As one interviewee said, Livable Tucson provided a comprehensive presentation to the Mayor and the Council of the goals that citizens wanted to achieve. The City Manager wanted to instill Livable Tucson as a living, breathing part of the budget process.

The Budget Format Committee seemed intent on strengthening the link between measurement and resource allocation. By encouraging semi-annual reporting to the City Manager prior to or with budget submissions, monitoring achievement of outcomes and resources used in producing outputs will give the City the capability of focusing on current conditions and achievement of performance results when the budget is allocated.

Actual Use

Interviewees confirmed that performance-measurement data was presented to the City Manager and elected officials as part of the budget process, although to a lesser extent with elected officials, whom two interviewees felt paid little attention to performance measures. Another interviewee said that during the FY1999-2000 budget process, none of the Council's decisions were related to performance measures. Yet another interviewee said that he/she had not seen performance measures used for decision making because performance measures do not indicate why things are happening.

An examination of the FY1999-2000 budget demonstrated the key outputs, outcomes, and a description of support for the Livable Tucson goals. It appears, therefore, that while performance measures may not be directly used to support the decision process, performance measures are used to inform and justify support for decisions once decisions are made. Concern about this very legitimate use of performance measures drove the Budget Format Committee to call for a formal performance reporting system “to avoid the appearance of performance measurement being just ‘window dressing’ in the budget” (Meyerson, 1999).

At the departmental level, interviewees indicated that performance measures were used for a variety of operational decisions, including establishing rates, tracking resources, developing departmental and divisional plans, making decisions about staffing, and then supporting those decisions in justifications to City management. One department uses efficiency measures, such as per unit costs, to track the impact of budget decisions. Another department uses performance measures to demonstrate changes in the nature and volume of the work being performed. Monthly and quarterly reports are tracked in most departments to look for performance anomalies that may require a shift in resources or decisions about staffing and operations to respond to apparent performance problems.

Effect of Use

The [Fire Department](#) is heavily into performance measurement, both due to leadership of the Department’s management, as well as due to the Department’s participation in the ICMA Comparative Performance Measures Project. According to the Fire Chief, the Department has been able to increase staffing and operational levels, a fact that he directly attributes to the Department’s use of performance measures. Detailed reports on specific areas of the City have been useful in generating political support for adding resources and building fire stations by demonstrating that the resources were needed to ensure service equity. Performance measurement was used to build support for a staff person who coordinated fire education activities. While it is often difficult for prevention activities to compete against emergency response and code enforcement service needs, the Department was able to demonstrate that the staff person had directly or indirectly touched the lives of 127,000 children, and was thus able to defend keeping the staff person on board when the grant-funding for her position expired.

Interviewees from other departments also mentioned that performance measures make it easier to support requests for additional resources, and that regular reporting prevents having to scramble to provide justification for what was accomplished during the prior fiscal year. This reinforces the finding made above that while some may question the utility of performance measures for making resource allocation and other decisions, measurement has demonstrated value for supporting and justifying those decisions once they have been made, and for forcing staff to think about who is served by City programs, and how citizens are served.

Strategic Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Performance Improvement

Performance measurement has been used to support the strategic planning process and is probably most useful for monitoring performance, and in selected cases, demonstrating performance improvement, albeit without the ability to provide information indicating why performance improved. The next session of the case study focuses on use of performance measures to target, monitor, and compare City program performance.

Intent and Expectations

Interviewees said that performance measures are intended to track what City departments do, how well the City departments perform those services, and to monitor how the City government is performing. While not addressed directly, interviewee comments indicated that there was an expectation that improvement in government performance would lead to more effective program performance. Senior managers indicated that even if not used for this purpose at higher levels of the government, there is an assumption that departments will use measures internally for this purpose. Several department interviewees said that performance measures were specifically used to monitor and improve performance, demonstrate the success of staff and programs in meeting targets, focus on customer service in cases where customer surveys are part of a department's performance-measurement system, and demonstrate performance against peers. The ICMA Project data is particularly useful for the latter, demonstrating how local programs compare on a national stage. Performance measures were expected to be useful both for focusing on things the City does incredibly well, as well as to provide information on service trends that otherwise might have been missed. With the City's strategic focus on Livable Tucson, there is a new expectation that performance measures will be used to monitor progress towards achieving goals promoted by the community and adopted by the Mayor and the Council. While there is no Citywide strategic plan, the key performance indicators provide the basis for historical comparisons of performance improvement on the seventeen Livable Tucson Goals.

Actual Use

The Fire Department used performance measures to support the Department's strategic planning process, highlighting areas that may need additional attention or resources to improve results. While the strategic planning process has been more informal, focusing on resource allocation during the budget process, interviewees indicated that the planning information had gotten to the point that a formal strategic plan could be developed. The ICMA Project data was particularly useful for this purpose, with the Department focusing on response time from call receipt, response time on service delivery, out-of-service time, patient outcomes for emergency services, fire loss, and arson statistics. The Fire Department's FY1999-2000 Recommended Operating Budget included two charts showing benchmarking information comparing Tucson's operating costs per capita and fire incidents per 100,000 for Fiscal Year 1995-1996. While not specifically referenced, the comparative data appears to be from the [ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Project](#). The Chief indicated in interviews that data were crucial during budget discussions and justification. Comparative information showing relatively low operating costs can be used to demonstrate the efficiency of operations, or alternatively can be used to show that additional resources are needed to produce better results.

While the [Community Services Department](#) does not have a strategic plan, the Department uses quarterly reporting to monitor progress against annual goals and as a trigger for action if goals are not met. ICMA and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) reports were used to gauge the City's performance against other jurisdictions, although concern was expressed as to whether such comparisons are "apples to apples." HUD required evaluation of the local housing authority based on the Public Housing Performance (PHP) program, which required tracking of private sector-type measures, such as turnover rate, occupancy rates, and

work order completion time. Reports produced for the Federal government provided an easier transition for the City in producing locally focused reports. A customer service measure is established for each division, and surveys are used to monitor progress against goals. Results are compiled into an overall customer services measure, to establish a target for the whole department. In cases where money is shared with community groups, the Department requires tracking of performance so that a community index can be established to track overall effectiveness and impact of services.

Individual departments, such as the Fire Department, do customer surveys. Other than some information included in the budget process and the Livable Tucson stated intent to measure the percentage of citizens rating local government as responsive, the City does not do a Citywide customer or citizen survey to measure perceptions of citizens towards the government, government programs, or to assess perceptions of government performance.

Interestingly, senior City managers did not provide any examples of strategic planning, performance monitoring, or performance improvement. This could be a reflection of senior management's acknowledgement that departments are expected to track performance measures for their own departments, even if regular reports are not sent to the City Manager. It is reasonable to expect that as the City becomes more experienced with the Livable Tucson community goal-setting and tracking process, and if regular reporting of performance measures is re-instituted, performance improvement will receive additional attention from City management.

Effect of Use

One interviewee indicated that performance measurement demonstrated the impact of politically-motivated proposals by being able to demonstrate the impact of ill-conceived proposals. Comparing departmental performance in the context of performance measures with other cities enhanced the value of performance measurement by equipping the department with demonstrated facts and figures. Overall, performance measurement provided an organizational sense of performance and helped create a consciousness of performance in carrying out City services.

While departments felt that performance measurement was useful for demonstrating departmental performance effectiveness and progress against targets and benchmarks, interviewees acknowledged that additional work is needed on development of cross departmental and community measures. [Livable Tucson](#) provided a vehicle for multi-departmental and community measurement, and progress against goals. Interviewees felt that additional work was required to show the interrelatedness of departmental performance. Some of those interviewed expressed concern about the difficulty in demonstrating performance results for factors that extend beyond the control of the City government (e.g., crime rate), but no one interviewed felt that this would interfere with development of a system for tracking progress on the Livable Tucson Goals.

Accountability and Communication

Interviewees were asked to assess the effect of performance measurement on accountability within the government, as well as the impact on external communication with the public and taxpayers. While external reporting has not been a driving force behind Tucson performance

measurement efforts, it is logical to assume that the more recent focus on Livable Tucson may result in additional expectations about the availability of performance measures, especially measures that can be used to monitor community conditions.

Intent and Expectation

In considering the intent of performance measurement for accountability and communication in Tucson, one interviewee suggested looking at the beginning of the process in the 1990s. This interviewee's impression was that for City Manager Michael Brown, performance-measurement reporting in the budget was part of a process to formalize accountability to citizens, the Mayor, and the Council, and for use as one basis for decision making. Part of the process involved identification and reporting a very large number of measures, which ultimately may have been the downfall of that phase of performance measurement. One interviewee outside of the City government was quite skeptical, stating that the intent of the early performance-measurement effort was to "fill up a bunch of pages in the budget so people would read the performance measures and not the budget." The interviewee concluded that performance measurement came into vogue under a City Manager who was constantly under fire for insisting that a system of his own design be put in place. Performance measures became a be-all and end-all, or in other words, a "bureaucratic shell game."

The experience was sufficiently traumatic that when Mr. Gutierrez became City Manager, he expressed concern about spending taxpayer dollars to communicate government performance and felt that the City government would be criticized for spending money to promote itself. As he put it, "Those that toot their own horn are broadly criticized, so we have chosen not to focus on those sorts of things."

Regarding the full history of performance measurement in Tucson, the skeptical point of view was not widely expressed among the government interviewees. One interviewee expressed the more common opinion among City government officials that performance measurement was a way to tell the public and those not familiar with government operations about what the government does, and how well or how badly the government is performing. When developing measures for communication and reporting, the intent was to try and see the measures the way a citizen might. Performance measurement was a legitimate tool to communicate with the public and was an important ingredient in giving citizens an understanding of municipal government and what is to be accomplished.

A citizen expressed an expectation that performance measurement reflected the priorities of the City in establishing a benchmark and accountability system as a way to self-measure. This individual expected to get an annual report card, which was discussed as a component of Livable Tucson with the intent of explaining priorities, goals, and targets, with comparison to actual results. The interviewee expected to see evidence of a proactive focus on best practices, with research demonstrating that the City's strategies are based on a desire to show results.

Interviewees extensively discussed expectations that performance measures would be used to hold managers and employees responsible for performance and results. The Budget Format Committee recommended that performance measurement be incorporated as part of department directors' annual personnel evaluations (Meyerson, 1999), although it is not clear if this means that department directors would be held accountable for using performance measures, or if it means that performance-measurement results would be used to assess director's annual performance. One interviewee indicated that division heads in his/her department were told that

divisions will be measured on specific measures and that measurement will play a role in determining accomplishments and outcomes. This interviewee said that the City Manager would be making it abundantly clear that performance measures were the basis on which department heads would be evaluated.

Actual Use

In terms of internal use of performance-measurement reports, many departmental interviewees said that they used monthly and quarterly reports as a tool for communication with managers and staff. In many cases, these reports were compiled to develop an annual report and are the source of information provided in the budget process. As indicated above, performance-measurement reports to the City Manager were limited when Mr. Gutierrez took office in 1996. The Budget Format Committee recommended a semi-annual performance-report process, although it remains to be seen if this process will be implemented. Although there may be exceptions, most annual reports appear to be exclusively distributed internally, a fact reinforced by the City Manager's resistance to external reporting, since external reporting gives the appearance of the government "tooting its own horn."

The budget is an obvious exception, in that the budget is both a resource allocation device and a mechanism for communicating within and outside of the government. For FY1999-2000, the budget included key outcomes, key outputs, and departmental contributions to Livable Tucson. One department reported wanting to make the process of reporting performance measurement even simpler, to make sure the community understands the information. According to this interviewee, the budget itself was made simpler, the process was more open, and the community was more involved, as evidenced by Livable Tucson. Interviewees did not address the extent of distribution of the budget. The budget summary included on the Department of Budget and Research web page included revenue and expenditure information, but did not include any performance measures. A brief scan of the City's web page, departments, and services revealed that while most departments included contact information and the department mission on their web pages, performance measures were not included on the website (as of February 19, 2000), with the exception of [Uniform Crime Report](#) statistics found on the Police website, and the listing of the Livable Tucson key indicators. As of February 19, 2000, targets and actual results for the indicators were not included on the [Livable Tucson](#) web page.

Some departments reported using performance measures to hold employees accountable through a performance-evaluation process. The City had a form for evaluation of all employees that participated in the "Pay for Performance Plan," although interviewees, including senior City management, did not discuss the criteria for this plan or who was included. The sixth category on which employees were evaluated encompassed employee-specific performance objectives. It appeared to be up to the individual department to decide whether specific performance-measurement-based targets would be incorporated in the performance-evaluation process.

One department claimed to use performance measures in employee performance evaluations and made an annual assessment of accomplishments against performance-based plans. While the interviewee claimed that accomplishments within the performance-based plan were reviewed, the extent of performance measurement use for setting performance targets and determining if targets were met was not clear. Another department looked at evaluation of employee performance every six months, examining such factors as quality, timeliness, safety, and attitude.

The department incorporated a work order system that was automated, allowing employees to log onto a computer to keep track of work. In performance appraisals, managers reviewed examples of where employees hit productivity targets. Another department established annual goals and conducted performance evaluations but stated that performance evaluations were not tied to performance measures.

Effect of Use

There was a sense among some interviewees that accountability is important and that the attention to performance measurement during the 1990s had done much to promote accountability throughout the City government. The PMAT system was said to have brought attention to the importance of tracking performance and achieving goals. Attention to accountability seemed especially heightened among department heads, as reflected by the activities and recommendations of the Budget Format Committee. Even with the changes in focus of performance-measurement efforts and the changes in the approach to performance reporting in the Office of the City Manager, the sense within the City government that accountability is important seems to have grown as a result of the City's performance measurement efforts.

When asked about the effect of performance measurement on communicating performance to taxpayers and citizens, one senior manager candidly responded, "Not much. Citizens still perceive that this place is mismanaged and that they are not getting much value for their money." Another interviewee also indicated that performance measurement had very little impact on communicating with citizens and taxpayers, stating that while citizens and the press could look at the extent to which City departments meet national performance standards, such as police, fire, and libraries, in reality, citizens and the press generally do not show much interest. The Community Services Department used key performance measures to communicate with the public, and an interviewee indicated that other departments, such as [Libraries](#) and [Parks and Recreation](#), do as well. An interviewee indicated that for all the talk about making the budget community-friendly, citizens will still not look at the budget, so that the major mechanism for reporting performance measures to the public is not likely to result in many citizens reviewing performance-related information.

However, while a small number of citizens probably review performance measures as reported in the budget document, one interviewee correctly pointed out that the budget is available to be reviewed, should someone desire to do so, and that accountability is thus strengthened. As one interviewee outside of the government structure said, many local government officials are "unwilling to explain [government operations and results] in a way that the average person can understand. A lot of officials don't want to share information in a forthright fashion. Tucson does. That is the exception, not the rule."

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

How is the quality of performance information perceived, and how have performance-measurement quality issues been addressed?

Perceptions of the Quality of Performance Information

Senior managers, department heads, and elected officials were asked to describe performance measures that are useful. These descriptions were analyzed to assess interviewee perceptions of performance measurement characteristics that support use. Multiple responses are noted. Responses included:

- useful for operations and resource allocation; meaningful (four interviewees);
- understandable (three interviewees);
- focused on accountability, outcome-oriented ; improved performance (three interviewees);
- consistent (two interviewees);
- comparable, supportive of benchmarking (two interviewees);
- pragmatic, reasonable, easy to capture (two interviewees);
- accurate;
- timely; and
- non-duplicative.

Some interviewees commented on how often measures met these criteria. There was no clear pattern to those responses. One interviewee said he/she sees measures meeting quality criteria every day, one said about 80 percent of measures reflect quality criteria, and one said that measures might meet one or two of the characteristics, but no more.

Efforts to Address Information Quality Issues

Interviewees were asked if anyone ever questioned the quality of measures. The most frequent response was that the [Budget and Research](#) Project Manager for Performance Systems questions data quality, which is logical, since Mr. Luebbermann's primary responsibility is to review the quality of performance measurement processes and results, and to provide technical assistance to departments. Budget and Research budget analysts were also mentioned, and, of course, department and division heads frequently said they themselves question the quality of measures. As indicated above, in 1998 the City Manager announced establishment of a team from Budget and Research and Human Resources to assist departments with their efforts. The team members and assigned budget analysts were directed to work with divisions to improve performance measurement efforts, which is clearly an attempt to address the quality of performance measures. Outside funding agencies, such as the Federal government, were also mentioned as sometimes questioning reports.

The Budget Format Committee, with Mr. Luebbermann's support, conducted a two-year review of the City's performance measures in relationship to how measures are reported in the budget, and in response to the Livable Tucson Project. As one interviewee put it, the effort took

departmental performance measures apart and put them back together again. Members of the Committee met with individual departments to help them rewrite and refine data. Those interviewees who commented on the process indicated that the results were useful, with a reduction in the number of measures and a general focus that more clearly reflected department and division missions.

The Fire Department described its efforts to ensure quality. Training was provided for employees with the rank of Captain or higher. After a three-month internal review process within the department, staff from the Evaluation Unit in Budget and Research reviewed every impact statement and every measure in the department. In addition, measures were subjected to review during the annual budget process. The Fire Department was planning to repeat the process, with both internal and external reviews, in an attempt to help ensure the quality of performance measures.

What kinds of organizational supports are provided, and how have organizations been changing to accommodate performance measurement?

Training was frequently cited as an organizational support for performance measurement. As indicated above, the Project Manager for Performance Systems provided training on development of departmental missions and key outputs and outcomes as components of the reformatting of the budget. As a component of the Livable Tucson Vision Project, extensive community training was provided. Two community trainings on government accountability were provided, funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and designed and facilitated by ICMA, the National Civic League, and the City. The trainings introduced community leaders to the role of the public in measuring government performance, including identifying the difference between outputs and outcomes. The trainings were useful for Budget and Research staff who worked with departments to develop performance measures, and who developed in-house training for city departments in the fall of 1997. Budget and Research staff trained over 200 key managers on how budgets should reflect community priorities. The FY1998-1999 budget was then formatted to reflect the community's goals. Six workshops were held in the spring of 1998 to develop indicators of livability related to each of the goals (City of Tucson, 1998).

As for organizational changes, the Evaluation Unit in the Budget and Research Department was established in 1996 to examine how City programs were working. Evaluation staff provided technical assistance to departments, provided training to Budget and Research analysts on how to evaluate services, and conducted evaluations. It is interesting to note that none of those interviewed, including the Director of Budget and Research, indicated that one of the roles of either Evaluation Unit staff or the Project Manager for Performance Systems was to audit performance measures, or otherwise ensure the validity and reliability of information reported.

The Fire Department promoted two staff members from within to focus on strategic planning and use of performance measures, and invested heavily in training and education for the staff to enable them to address quality issues. In addition, the department was planning to bring a new data system on board to allow information to be more easily retrieved, to more easily produce reports, and to support providing data for the ICMA Project.

EVOLUTION OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

What barriers have been identified to making effective use of performance measurement, and are those barriers being addressed?

Given the evolution of performance measurement in Tucson during the 1990s, particularly in the period from 1993 to 1996, it is not surprising that one interviewee indicated that one barrier to effective use of performance measures is collecting large volumes of data that are not useful or used. What is surprising is that only one interviewee said so. The most frequent barrier cited by interviewees was addressing the perception that staff lacks the time to collect performance information (three interviewees). Three interviewees addressed the issue of support for performance measurement efforts, indicating that performance measurement will not last if it is viewed as a fad, if the organization cannot be convinced of the value of performance information, or if the City Manager believes that measurement and reporting are not important. Two interviewees indicated that fear of exposure or accountability was a barrier or problem that must be addressed. Other barriers cited by interviews included:

- lack of standards to ensure fair comparisons of services or organizational contexts that may be different;
- the perception that performance measurement is complex, when it actually is common sense;
- difficulty identifying meaningful measures; and
- the difficulty of establishing a focus on community outcomes, and a system for collecting data from the community.

What lessons have been learned from the performance measurement experience to date?

Interviewees were asked what lessons they had learned from using performance measurement to date. In response, a wide range of answers was provided, including:

- performance measurement must be instilled in the culture, or else it is difficult to make measurement happen in a short time; buy-in from middle and lower levels of the organization is critical, since data is generated at that level (two interviewees);
- if there had been a stronger signal from top (City Manager and his staff) concerning the importance of performance measurement and an indication of how it was going to be used, then some of the growing pains could have been minimized,
- measurement effort needs to be deliberate, but consciously and strategically brought forward;
- work from mission statement backwards, with each department and division developing a mission statement and measures to address that mission;

- tell the truth;
- continue to refine measures and systems so measurement can be a useful communication tool; develop systems for routine collection and reporting of data;
- find mutual value for citizens and professionals in the organization; and
- if you do a good job identifying measures, and are faithful about collecting data, there are no barriers.

What are future expectations for the use of performance measurement?

One skeptical outside observer of [Tucson](#)'s government processes had this to say about the future of performance measurement in Tucson: "I expect it to go out of style. Everything does. Maybe it is the way it arrived on the scene. Maybe I am so parochial [that] I don't know what is going on in rest of world. I see it as the current fashion. They didn't invent evaluation and performance measurement. It has always been a tool."

Other interviewees were somewhat more optimistic, expecting the role of performance measurement to continue to grow. One department felt that performance measurement would take the department to another level of service in three to five years by allowing the department to demonstrate populations in need and new types of services to meet those needs. Another department expected more emphasis on performance measurement and more reporting about performance because of the value of information to professionals, managers, constituencies, and governing bodies. The interviewee expected greater emphasis in the future, with deliberate, iterative development of measurement activities and a linkage within the next year with the community itself. Finally, one interviewee said that he/she hoped that the result of continued development of measures would not be increased productivity, but rather better allocation of dollars and creation of a more level playing field, where allocation of resources is based not on the loudest voice, but rather on strategic outcomes to be achieved.

REFERENCES

Annotated references are sorted sequentially by date.

Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. About Tucson. Tucson, Arizona: Tucson Chamber of Commerce. 1997. Available: <http://www.tucsonchamber.org/atindex.htm> (Downloaded February 19, 2000).

The Chamber's website included information about the City's demographics and history.

Gutierrez, Luis G., City Manager. July 20, 1998. "Technical Assistance with Department Performance Measurement." Tucson, AZ: Office of the City Manager.

This memo to Department Directors and Division Heads described the 1997 efforts of the Budget Format Committee, including streamlining and simplifying the budget so that it more effectively communicates to the community, and highlighting City services by emphasizing key measures of performance and outcomes that describe the community benefit of programs. This memorandum called for additional emphasis on performance measurement "in order to help us focus on what is important and ultimately improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization" (p. 1). It announced establishment of a team from Budget and Research and Human Resources to assist departments with their efforts. The team members and assigned budget analysts were directed to work with divisions to improve performance measurement efforts.

International City/County Management Association (ICMA). 2000. "ICMA Center for Performance Measurement." Washington, DC: ICMA. (Downloaded February 19, 2000).

<http://icma.org/go.cfm?cid=1&gid=3&sid=101>

Included information about the ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Project, such as participants and services included. City of Tucson Department of Budget and Research. Developing Your Department's Mission Statement, Overview, Impact Statements, Division Mission Statements, and Key Outputs and Outcomes. Tucson, Arizona: Department of Budget and Research. 1997.

Provided guidance to departments on preparation of budget. Guidance was provided on development of a mission statement to capture the rationale for existence of the department; an overview to describe major services, activities, products, results, and department organization; impact statements describing the department's impact on community problems or issues, or how internal departments efforts affect the City organization; division mission statements; and key outputs and key outcomes for each division. The guidance called for three to five key outputs and one to three key outcomes per division, in order to focus on the most important work of the division. Two pages of examples of key outputs and key outcomes were included in the guidance.

Luebbemann, Tony. 1997. Performance Measurement and the FY1998-1999 Budget Format. Tucson, AZ: Department of Budget and Research.

Included slides from a presentation to City staff on the new budget format introduced for FY1998-1999, including information about performance measurement. The intent of the new format was to communicate "more clearly to the community the impacts of city services and out commitment to council initiatives." The format was intended to put more emphasis on outcomes

versus outputs and eliminate measures that do not clearly communicate key program achievements to citizens.

City of Tucson. The Livable Tucson Vision Program. Tucson, Arizona: City of Tucson. 1998. Available: <http://www.ci.tucson.az.us/livable.htm> (Downloaded: February 15, 2000).

Brochure and web page described the Livable Tucson Vision Program, which “seeks to make Tucson a better place to live by engaging the community in an inclusive planning process to identify common values, priorities, strategies, and measurable indicators of progress that will be used to shape Tucson’s future.” The Mayor and Council of Tucson initiated the project. Two community trainings on government accountability, funded by the Alfred Sloan Foundation, were designed and facilitated by the International City/County Managers Association, the National Civic League, and the City. The trainings introduced community leaders to their role in measuring government performance, including identifying the difference between outputs and outcomes. Livable Tucson includes seventeen goals that were priorities most commonly articulated by over 700 citizens who participated in community forums. Six workshops in the spring of 1998 developed indicators of livability related to each of the Goals. A total of 69 key indicators of progress were associated with the Livable Tucson Goals. According to the brochure, an annual “community report card” will be developed to monitor progress towards the goals. Interviewees did not mention the annual report card during the June 1999 site visit, so it is unclear whether a report card has yet been developed. A very thorough description of each of the goals and the key results may be found on the web site.

Meyerson, Ronald L., Chair, Budget Format Committee. March 15, 1999. “Performance Measurement Reporting.” Tucson, AZ: Department of Operations.

This memo to the City Manager provided an update on performance measurement reporting, and discussions among department heads. The memorandum indicated that while performance measures had been reported in the budget for four years, there was a general feeling that a formal reporting system was needed to avoid performance measures merely being window dressing in the budget, and that establishment of a reporting system could improve performance by identifying and eliminating outputs and outcomes that are difficult to measure or of little utility in improvement efforts. Department directors felt that outcomes should be emphasized; meetings should be held with the City Manager to discuss performance measurement and achievements; external department performance reports to the City Manager should be semi-annual (just prior to budget submission) or annual (at the end of the fiscal year) to limit impact on administrative staff, with internal reporting more frequent at the discretion of the department director; achievements and significant performance issues should be discussed at the annual budget meeting with the City Manager; expanded role for Deputy and Assistant City Managers, to include performance reporting by their assigned departments; and incorporating performance measurement as part of a director’s annual personnel evaluation. The memorandum concludes, “Without citywide periodic review by executive management, performance measurement efforts will continue to be inconsistent and uneven across the City.”

City of Tucson Department of Community Services. Third Quarter Performance Measures. Tucson, Arizona: Department of Community Services. January 8, 1999.

Example of a quarterly report updating one department's performance measures. Measures included key outputs, key outcomes, and recurring performance measures. Measures track with measures included in the annual budget. Comments column allows for explanatory information.

City of Tucson Fire Department. TFD Suppression Response Quarterly Report. Tucson, Arizona: Tucson Fire Department. April 1999.

Example of a quarterly report on the Fire Department's response time, including percent of responses of five minutes or less, eight minutes or less, and more than eight minutes. Demonstrated average response time of 4.7 minutes. Report also includes paramedic response times of less than eight minutes, ten minutes, fifteen minutes, and twenty minutes. Demonstrated average response time of 5.6 minutes. The Fire Department also included a comparison of average response time by fire company and shift.

City of Tucson Department of Operations. Fleet Services Quarterly Report. Tucson, Arizona: Department of Operations. April 1999.

Quarterly report included key outputs and outcomes for fleet services. Report showed first and second quarter summaries, as well as monthly results for the third quarter, and summary results. The FY1998-1999 Adopted Performance Level is included as a benchmark. A comments column allowed the Fleet Services Division to provide explanatory information to help interpret performance reports.

———. August 12, 1999. "Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about City Government." Tucson. (Downloaded: February 15, 2000).

Available: <http://www.ci.tucson.az.us/livable.htm> (Downloaded: February 15, 2000).

Frequently asked questions included information about the Council-Manager form of government.

City of Tucson. Pay for Performance Appraisal Form. Tucson, Arizona: Human Resources Department. 1999.

Form used to evaluate all employees that participate in the "Pay for Performance Plan." The sixth category on which employees are evaluated encompasses employee-specific performance objectives. It appears to be up to the individual department to decide whether specific performance-measurement based targets will be incorporated in the review process.

———. 1999. FY1999-2000 Recommended Operating Budget, Fire Department. Tucson: Department of Budget and Research.

Example of the format of the FY1999-2000 operating budget. As indicated in materials on preparation of the FY1998-1999 budget, included mission statements for each division, key outputs, and key outcomes. Four columns of data are included: prior year actual measures (FY1997-1998); current year adopted (FY1998-1999); current year estimated (FY98-99); and a recommended level of performance for the next fiscal year, which is the focus of the budget. The budget included a section on how the Fire Department supported the Livable Tucson goals. A series of impact statements illustrate the impact the department hoped to have in the community. Two charts show benchmarking information comparing Tucson's operating costs per capita and fire incidents per 100,000 for Fiscal Year 1995-1996. While not specifically

referenced, the comparative data appears to be from the ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement Project. The Chief indicated in interviews were crucial during budget discussions and justification.

International City/County Management Association (ICMA). ICMA Center for Performance Measurement. Washington, DC: ICMA. 2000. Available:

<http://icma.org/go.cfm?cid=1&gid=3&sid=101> (Downloaded February 19, 2000).

<http://www.tucsonchamber.org/atindex.htm>

The Chamber's website included information about the City's demographics and history.